



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

because Chaucer's pilgrims set out under that constellation.

On the whole, M. Jusserand has effectively met the objections raised; and until a better equipped *advocatus diaboli* takes up the contention, the present writer agrees with him that the claim of James has not been invalidated.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH PHONETICS.

Artikulations- und Hörübungen, von H. KLINGHARDT: Praktisches Hülfsbuch der Phonetik für Studierende und Lehrer. Mit 7 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. Cöthen: Otto Schulze, 1897; pp. viii, 253.

THE author explains in an interesting introduction the origin and aims of his work, which is the result of his prolonged experience as an enthusiastic and skilful teacher of modern languages in German colleges. It is not meant to increase the number of excellent text-books that treat of phonetics in general, or of French, German and English phonetics in particular; it is to be looked upon, rather, as a phonetic drill-book for young instructors, and students preparing to be teachers of modern languages. They are not expected to get from it, or from it alone, their knowledge of phonetics, but are advised to use it either before, or at the same time with, the systematic study of a regular text-book like Vietor's *Elemente der Phonetik und Orthoepie des Deutschen, Englischen und Französischen*. The author wishes to teach them by his own example how to make use of such knowledge, which, unless assisted by well-directed and long-continued practical exercises, is liable to remain barren theory, unprofitable for teaching or learning a foreign language, as well as of very doubtful value for carrying on scientific research. Thus, all his descriptions, suggestions and advice, and all the exercises he recommends, tend to awaken and strengthen the desire of independent observation and to give a thorough control of the speech-organs:

Was meine jungen Fachgenossen betrifft, so hoffe ich, dass die von mir gebotenen Beschrei-

bungen und vorgeschlagenen Übungen unter allen Umständen dazu dienen werden, zu ihrem phonetischen Wissen auch noch einiges phonetische Können d. i. einige phonetische Fertigkeit hinzuzufügen."¹

Mr. Klinghardt is a good teacher not only in the classroom but in most of his writings, and especially in the present book. His explanations are exceedingly clear (*anschaulich*), though sometimes rather long. He does not employ much apparatus, but contents himself with a few diagrams in the first part of his work, and requires of his readers only to do exactly as he does, to use their own eyes, aided by a mirror, their own ears and their own speech-muscles, in examining and reproducing his observations and experiments so as to become their own observations and experiments. Such a procedure, highly commendable, and in fact the only method to be recommended for the study of a phonetic book, demands time and patience; but in the author's opinion, the student does not need to read the whole work at once, and may take up at different times any chapter he may think most convenient and most useful for the occasion.

Some oral instruction in phonetics I regard as almost indispensable for the beginner. However, the elements of this science once fully understood, I think he will go on very well by reading the *Artikulations- und Hörübungen* in the manner prescribed or suggested by the author, and he will doubtless learn from him to train his eye, ear, and speech-muscles, to observe phonetic phenomena independently, and to distinguish clearly all the different sounds and articulations, or series of sounds and articulations, mentioned or hinted at in Mr. Klinghardt's work.

I frankly confess that at first I could not help looking with some suspicion at:

Part I. *Nichtsprachliche* Artikulationen und Schalle.

A. Die Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes, a. Bau des Kehlkopfes und seiner Schlussmittel; b. Artikulationen der Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes und zugehörige Schalle.

B. Das Gaumensegel, a. Bau des Gaumensegels; b. Artikulationen des Gaumensegels.

C. Der Unterkiefer mit Zunge und Lippe, a. Bau des Unterkiefers (mit Zunge und Lippe); b. Artikulationen des Unterkiefers (der Zunge und Lippe).

¹ Page 7.

² Pages 11-75.

This preliminary part appeared to me altogether too long, and seemed to treat too diffusely of some well-known phenomena of articulation like laughing, coughing, swallowing, which are in no direct relation to the subject of the book—speech. But I have changed my opinion, after a careful study of the whole work, and am inclined to think it the best done and most important part, since the book is planned especially for beginners in phonetics. In the first place, the nature of these common-place phenomena is, in reality, not well-known and not well understood, precisely because they are common-place things; and, secondly, they serve admirably the pedagogic ends of the author, who explains very well in connection with them the structure of the upper breath and speech-organs, and also prepares and facilitates, in this way, the explanation of the phenomena of speech proper in Part II.

The First Part, therefore, is a sort of *proædæutic* introduction to the phonetic study of every language. It will be read with much profit by students of any nationality, provided they understand German sufficiently; and the statements and descriptions contained in it are such as not to call forth any critical remarks on the part of the expert. It is different with Part II:3 *Sprachliche Artikulationen und Schalle*.

A. Die Schlussmittel des Kehlkopfes, a. Weite Öffnung (gehauchte Laute); b. Knorpelenge (geflüsterte Laute); c. Ritzenenge (getönte Laute); d. Kehlkopfverschluss (Explosivlaut); e. Resonanzräume und Resonanzen.

B. Das Gaumensegel.

C. Der Unterkiefer mit Zunge und Lippe, a. Allgemeines; b. die einzelnen Lautreihen: Konsonantenreihen, Vokalreihen und Gleitlautreihen.

According to the author's opinion, repeatedly and clearly enough expressed, he has written his work chiefly for the present and future teachers of modern languages, that is, French and English, in German schools and colleges. But if we consider only this class of readers, who would naturally expect to find a great deal of information especially adapted to the needs and requirements of their vocation, the instruction of French and English, he evidently speaks, in the principal part,⁴ by far too much

of German sounds and articulations, and too little of English and French phonetics. He says nothing of the peculiar treatment of French plosives without a breath-glide before vowels, in opposition to the linguistic habits of Germans (p^h, t^h, k^h); nothing of the formation of narrow and wide, tense and lax vowels,—a very important topic, to be sure, in the study of French and English vocalism; and nothing definite of the articulation and acoustic quality of mixed vowels,—a very characteristic feature of English vocalism. Indeed, he mentions foreign sounds and articulations very sparingly and only for the sake of comparison and illustration. I, therefore, think his work offers more and greater advantages to two classes of readers which he does not seem to have had in view at all; that is to say, such Germans as desire to get a thorough knowledge of the phonetic system of their mother tongue, and foreigners who would like to study German phonetics considered from the German point of view, and treated by a native well-acquainted with other languages and the general purport of his subject. It is principally on account of the latter class that the book deserves warm commendation and unlimited praise in an American journal.

Doubtless, the German neo-philologists will find also in the Second Part enough to interest and help them. They will more easily get by the aid of both parts an adequate and an extensive training in general phonetics than by means of any other book I know of; and guided by some of the skilful and pedagogic exercises suggested in the second part, they will discover the best means of "hearing," observing and understanding all the peculiarities of their pupils' German pronunciation, varying from province to province, from town to town, from community to community, from individual to individual, even in the same class-room. Thus they will learn to explain these peculiarities of sound by corresponding peculiarities of articulation, and such an experience will best enable them to smooth over the difficulties their pupils have to encounter, and successfully to correct the mistakes they are liable to make in their first endeavors to

3 Pages 76-250.

4 That is, in Part II.

5 Cf. pages 213, 217, and Nachträge, pages 252-253.

imitate foreign sounds and sound-combinations.

I am glad to hear that the excellent work has already won many friends among the author's colleagues in Germany. One of them, Dr. H. Schmidt, a practical teacher of modern languages at the *Realschule* or *Realgymnasium* of Altona-Ottensen, speaks of it with sincere admiration, "without the least admixture of fault-finding criticism," in a long article of the last issue of the *Neueren Sprachen*.⁶ This article is remarkable for the intelligent and complete account it gives of the contents of the whole book.

The Supplement⁷ contains some critical remarks upon Part ii, which the author received from Mr. Paul Passy and Mr. Vietor during and after the composition of his work. I shall add a few more, but I shall be very brief, giving by no means all of the notes I have collected.

The division into breathed, whispered and voiced sounds (*gehauchte, geflüsterte, gefönte Laute*), which goes like a *Leit-Motiv* through the different chapters of this part, is very convenient, giving a great deal of symmetry to K's exposition and rendering it very interesting and instructive. It seems to me, however, that whisper is in this way allowed too prominent a place in a book treating of speech. For whisper is nothing but hybrid speech, a poor substitute for genuine speech caused by disease or by particular temporary conditions of the speaker. I also think that the separation of whispered sounds (*Knorpelenge*: cartilaginous glottis open, glottis proper or vocal chords closed), on the one hand, and breathed and voiced sounds (*weite Öffnung*: the whole glottis open; *Ritzenenge*: cartilaginous glottis closed, and glottis proper open with vocal chords brought near enough to one another to vibrate), on the other hand, is never strictly carried out in the real life of language, and that what we recognize as whisper seldom agrees exactly with K's definition.

§§31-32:⁸ *h*—gehauchte vokale: *h^u, h^o, h^a, h^e, hⁱ—f, r, m, n, g, ŋ*.

Page 78: Man hat diesen *h*-Laut in vielfach verschiedener Weise zu bestimmen gesucht.

⁶ July, 1897, pages 199-215.

⁷ Nachträge, pages 250-253.

⁸ Pages 76-81.

Da ich mich hier grundsätzlich (!) nicht auf die Erörterung abweichender Ansichten einlasse, so kann ich den Leser nur auffordern, selbst meine Darstellung nachzuprüfen.

I doubt whether *h* is the same sound in every language; for instance, that German *h* is the same as English *h* or, even, *h* in French dialects (K. does not say expressly whether he speaks only of German *h*, or of *h* in general); I also doubt the opinion that *h* is formed with the same position of the vocal chords (wide open) as the voiceless or, as K. calls them, breathed consonants *p, f, t, s*, etc.; that *h* must be identified with breathed vowels, that it must be pronounced with the same vowel position of the mouth organs as the vowels by which it is followed, and that this vowel position must be a primary element in the formation of *h*. I wonder what view K. takes of the position and movement of the vocal chords in pronouncing *p—a* in French *par*, and *ph—a* in German *Paar* (he never mentions French *p, t, k* before vowels)? To solve these and similar difficult questions, we need better aids than eye, ear, mirror, and the feeling of the speech-muscle; here, we are forced to make use of phonetic instruments and the researches of experimental phoneticians like Rousselot.⁹

One looks in vain for the plosives *p, t, k—b, d, g* in the three long chapters of Part ii, A, a—c, pp. 76-117, where K. speaks of breathed, whispered and voiced sounds, vowels as well as fricative and liquid consonants; and one is quite astonished to meet with *k, t, p* or, rather, the *k-, t-, p-* series at the end of the last chapter of Part ii, A, e (*Resonanzräume und Resonanzen*), p. 136, where he compares them, in regard to formation and resonance, with the glottal plosive or glottal catch. This plosive is fully treated and well explained in a preceding separate chapter, Part ii, A, d: *Kehlkopfverschluss (Explosivlaut)*. The author then mentions a *k-* and *g-* series, a *t-* and *d-* series and a *p-* and *b-* series, beside seven other series of consonants in Part ii, B, § 75 (*Artikulation mit Hochstellung des Gaumensegels*: 10 *Konsonantengruppen*), and *k, t, p—g, d, b* (whis-

⁹ On this occasion I wish to call the reader's attention to Abbé Rousselot's new book, the first part of which has just come out: *Principes de phonétique expérimentale*, Paris and Leipzig, H. Welter, 1897.

pered)—*g, d, b* several times in Part ii, C, a, § 76 (*gehauchte, geflüsterte, getönte Luftströme und Sprechlaute*), § 77 (die Organe, mit denen auf diesen Luftströmen gespielt wird: Unterkiefer, Unterlippe, Zunge). In the last chapter of the book, Part ii, C, b, he again leaves out the plosives among the *Konsonantenreihen* (*Kratzlaute, Zischlaute, Lispellaute*, etc.), and finally places them among the *Gleitlautreihen*, or series of glides: § 95 die *p, t* und *k*-Reihen, § 96 die *lenes*-Reihen (*b, d, g, b̥, d̥, g̥*).

We may define *p, t, k—b, d, g* as stop-articulations, labial and lingual (with different parts of the tongue), either preceded by a closing glide and followed by an opening glide (for instance, *apa*), or only followed by an opening glide (for instance, *pa*), or only preceded by a closing glide (for instance, *ap*, in German and English, but rarely or, at least, not necessarily in French; compare German *Knapp*, English *cap*, and French *pape*), and rendered audible by these glides. But in spite of the definition, they appear to us, to our ear and to our linguistic feeling (*Sprachgefühl*), as individual, single sounds, and we are not justified in calling them glides, although glides are an important element in their formation. We perceive clapping, whipping, cutting, splitting, tearing, as noises; and we are quite right in considering as noise-sounds or consonants the plosives *p, t, k*, etc., which are similar to those noises in nature.

§§ 73-74: Artikulation mit Ruhelage des Gaumensegels: a. *η, n, m*; b. nasalierte Vokale. § 75: Nasalierte Vokale sind aber keine mustergültigen Laute für uns, sie gehören nur den Dialekten, nicht der deutschen Hochausprache an¹⁰ Die drei letzten unter den konsonantischen Reihen (*k, g—t, d—p, b*) werden durch solche artikulatorische Veränderung (that is, by pronouncing them with the uvula lowered as in ordinary breathing) akustisch bis zu völliger Unkenntlichkeit entstellt¹¹ . . . Der akustische Unterschied solcher Konsonanten, die fälschlich mit Athemlage des Gaumensegels gesprochen werden, von ihren korrekten, mit Hochstellung gesprochenen Gegenstücken ist vor allen Dingen eine auffallende Undeutlichkeit.¹²

Habitual nasalizers, individual persons, and the entire population of certain provinces, for

¹⁰ Page 147.

¹¹ Page 147.

¹² Page 148.

instance Holstein, belonging to a country in whose literary or ruling dialect nasal vowels are not recognized as correct by the usage of the educated classes, are liable to modify all the sounds, but the degree and extent of nasalizing is very variable in their pronunciation. Often, their articulation, generally speaking, not only in regard to the uvula, is extremely weak. This has been very well observed by K. in Holstein pronunciation, and he gives some very curious examples of feeble articulation in § 93. With nasalizers, vowels as well as consonants become more or less indistinct, and together with the other consonants, also *m, n* and *η*, because the closure of the oral passage, with lips and tongue, is carried out imperfectly, and the uvula is lowered without vigor and energy. It would have been useful to compare in §§ 73-75 the vowels of mere nasal twang with the regular nasal vowels in French, which, in consequence of their peculiar formation and quite in accordance with the general character of the language, are exceedingly clear and distinct. I do not believe that even inveterate nasalizers change *k, t, p—g, d, b* into real *η, n, m* (voiceless and voiced); *Bock, Bett, Kup—Lage, Lade, Labz*. They cannot resist the desire and necessity of making themselves understood, and generally manage, by means of slight changes of articulation, to distinguish sufficiently between *η, n, m* (voiceless and voiced) and nasalized *k, t, p—g, d, b*.

§ 85: ¹³ Die *r*-Laute, a. ungerollte *r*-Laute, [*r*] und [*R*] (getönt, geflüstert, gehaucht), b. gerollte *r*-Laute, *r* und *R* (getönt und gehaucht).

Cf. *Nachträge*, pp. 251-252, with Passy's and Viator's remarks and Klinghardt's reply, both very interesting.

I think K. is not justified in placing mere substitutes, secondary sounds, the untrilled *r* and *R*=[*r*] and [*R*] before the original and primary sounds, the trilled *r* and *R*. Even the trilled *R* (uvular or velar, cf. Northern French *roi*) is only a secondary sound in relation to the trilled *r* (lingual, cf. Southern French *roi*); and it would be unwise to place *R* before *r*, although it would agree with the general order of the book, which is based upon

¹³ Pages 186-196.

the natural position of the articulating organs, beginning with the glottis. But *R* is very similar to *r* in the manner of articulation and in acoustic impression. An ordinary hearer, unprejudiced by phonetic studies, cannot easily distinguish a well-trilled *R* from an *r*. However, the two substitutes which K. puts in the first place are deprived of the trill, the characteristic feature of an *r*-sound, and are really very different sounds. If we call them untrilled *r* and *R*, and mark them, in phonetic script, by signs derived from these letters, for instance *ɹ* and *ʀ*, we do so only for convenience and for historical reasons. When we hear them in a literary language or in dialects related to it, we naturally identify them with *r*, and are predisposed to perceive them as consonants resembling a trilled *r* or *R*; for we are influenced by school-instruction and orthography, and accustomed to hear a real *r* or *R* in the same words in the pronunciation of other speakers, in the same region or in other parts of the country. We, therefore, hesitate to consider those sounds as identical with, or very similar to, some of the other fricative consonants to be met with in the same language or dialect, and are inclined to discover differences that, perhaps, do not exist in reality. But if a missionary should hear the so-called untrilled *r* (lingual, with several varieties, cf. *run* in English and American pronunciation) and *R* (uvular or velar, cf. *parler* in popular Parisian pronunciation and *fragen*, frequent in Central and North German pronunciation), sometimes voiced and sometimes voiceless, in the speech of a savage tribe, and should endeavor to fix a few sentences of such a dialect in phonetic spelling, I am sure he would not hesitate very long: he would transcribe those sounds, on the one hand, by *ð* (*p*) or *ʒ* (*s*), or perhaps even *z* (*s*) or *j* (*ç*), and, on the other hand, by *ɣ* (*x*), and it would never occur to him that he heard something similar to an *r*-sound.

§ 90⁴. . . Die ganze Reihe *a, ɔ, o, u*, lässt sich, wenn nicht in vollendeter, so doch in befriedigender (!) Weise, bei durchaus passivem Verhalten nicht nur der Zunge sondern auch der Lippen, durch stufenweise Hebung des Unterkiefers bilden, welche immer stärkere, flache

und passive Verkleinerung des Mundlippen-thores zu folge hat

I think K. is mistaken if he believes that the formation of *ɔ, o, u* assumed by him will be accepted by many people as satisfactory. These vowels produced in the manner described in § 90 are other sounds; they are not *ɔ, o, u*; they are very different from them in spite of some vague acoustic resemblance. Suppose an Englishman, speaking French, should pronounce (which he really very often does) the English mixed sound *ä* (*fur, burn*) instead of *æ* in the French words *heure, beurrr, honneur*; I admit that he utters a vowel somewhat similar to the French *æ*; for if there were no similarity, the Englishman would not select that mixed vowel of his native phonetic system, and he would not be understood by the hearer, in pronouncing *heure, beurrr, honneur*. But I am not at all satisfied with his pronunciation, and do not admit that he has pronounced the vowel *æ* "if not perfectly, yet satisfactorily," or that French *æ* and English *ä* are the same sounds.

It seems that the author is rather frequently carried away by the charm of his method of treating sounds rather in series of variable sounds than in the more or less fixed form of the normal sounds of a definite language, and he is, therefore, apt to overlook the importance of such normal sounds in phonetic discussions. This renders it difficult to understand, in every case, the exact meaning of his statements. Cf. *y, i, î*, in § 90, especially pp. 213 and 217, with P. Passy's remark and K's reply, *Nachträge*, pp. 252-253.

§ 91:15 Der unbestimmte Vokal *ə* . . . Allmählich wird man aber lernen, *a* und *ə* abwechselnd bei vollkommen oder nahezu (!) identischer Zungeneinstellung hervorzubringen. Der einzige (?) Artikulationsakt, den man dann aber immer noch bei dem Uebergange *ə > a* beobachten wird, das ist eine plötzliche stärkere Anspannung des Gaumensegels, welche mit Höherziehen und damit natürlich auch leichter Verschmälerung des vorher sehr breiten Gaumenthores verknüpft ist. Und nunmehr suche man durch uner müdliche Übung eine sichere, bewusste Herrschaft zu gewinnen über die Bedingungen für Bildung von *ə*—Ruhelage sämtlicher (?) Organe, nämlich des in angegebener Weise eingestellten Unterkiefers, der Lippen, der Zunge (?) und des Gaum-

ensegels (in Hochstellung)—und über diejenigen, welche die Voraussetzung bilden für Bildung von *a*, nämlich Ruhelage von Unterkiefer, Lippen und Zunge, aber kräftige Anspannung des Gaumensegels.¹⁶ . . . Zwei hiesige Ärzte (in Rendsburg) haben bei einer gemeinschaftlichen Untersuchung mit dem Kehlkopfspiegel die von mir S. 230 angedeutete Artikulation des Kehlkopfdeckels direkt beobachtet: wenn ich von *a* zu *ə*, was allerdings erst eingeübt sein will, überging, so senkte sich der Deckel, und richtete sich beim Übergange von *ə* zu *a* auf.¹⁷

§ 91 is one of the most interesting paragraphs in the whole book. But it seems strange that the author speaks here only of the German weak (unstressed) vowel *ə* in *hatte*, *schreibe*, *Katze*, *gesehen*, *erfahren*, *berichten*, and does not compare it with the analogous sounds, weak (unstressed), lax, wide, in French and English: French *ə* (*degré*), slightly rounded, between *ø* and *œ*, sometimes nearer to *œ*, sometimes nearer to *ø*, tongue-articulation certainly approaching the "mixed" position; English *ə* (*never*), unrounded, representing a variety or rather several varieties of the mixed vowel *ä* (cf. *fur*). It is still stranger that he identifies, without any comment,¹⁸ this German *ə*, so different from French *ə* and English *ə*, with mere voice, the *Stimmton* (produced by the vocal chords alone and not modified by any tongue-articulation), which, of course, is the same in German, French and English, and which he derives, with his students and readers, by a very skilful process from the voiced consonants *m*, *n*, *l*, *g*, *d*, *b*, *v*, *z*, etc. He assumes that the tongue holds a neutral, quiet position in pronouncing the common German *a*.¹⁹ This is true of a certain variety, perhaps the most frequent variety of German *a*, and, certainly, of K's own usual *a*. But it is impossible that the tongue holds the same neutral position in pronouncing German *ə* (*hatte*). The tongue-articulation of this sound is indeed very weak, but it is quite marked in my own pronunciation, and the movement of the tongue is very distinct, when I compare *ə* with *a*: *Aae*=*a:ə*. No doubt, the German *ə* can be very easily changed, and probably is rather frequently changed, into mere voice or *Stimm-*

ton in careless pronunciation. But, on the whole, it is a separate vowel with tongue-articulation, though rather variable in its nature, just like the other weak vowels, French *ə* and English *ə*; it is a mixed vowel, unrounded, lax, wide, and represents varieties of *ä*.²⁰ What K. reports respecting the different activity of velum and epiglottis in the production of *a* and *ə*, is highly instructive. It confirms what we know: German *ə* is a wide vowel, German *a* is generally a narrow vowel.

§ 92:²¹ *Vokaldiagramme*. In this paragraph, the author praises and explains again his own method of studying and teaching phonetics by the aid of ear, eye, mirror and speech-muscle, and speaks with much distrust and some contempt of the use of diagrams and sound-tablets. I do not approve of all that is here expressed, but I should not attempt criticism if the opinion advanced concerned only the instruction of young teachers and students of philology, and not the method to be followed by a modern language teacher in the class-room in schools and colleges. This is evidently the case, and changes the aspect of the question entirely. As a teacher of phonetics, K. is at liberty to use any method he likes; and he proves by his book that his method, in this respect, is an excellent one. But teaching phonetics, and teaching a foreign language are two very different things; and what is good and indispensable for the specialist, the philologist and the teacher, may be useless or of secondary importance, perhaps even hurtful, in a certain sense, for the general student who wishes to learn a foreign language.

1. A thorough knowledge of phonetics, theory and practice, general and special, is desirable and, I think, absolutely necessary for the one, since he has to *teach* the spoken language; the other needs very little phonetics—only so much as to be enabled to *learn* the correct pronunciation.

2. The aim of modern language instruction in schools and colleges is to teach a foreign language: the student learns to speak, read, and write, in different degrees of perfection, of course, in accordance with the special aims

¹⁶ Page 229.

¹⁷ K's letter of April 20, 1897.

¹⁸ Page 227.

¹⁹ Cf. § 90, pp. 209 f., and § 91, p. 229.

²⁰ Klinghardt and I use the signs of the international phonetic alphabet of the *Maître Phonétique*.

²¹ Pages 231-234.

of the class and the institution. Phonetics and grammar are not ends; they are aids and means to attain the end.

3. The value of grammar, in modern language instruction is about the same as that of phonetics. They ought to go together and ought to be treated alike, especially at the beginning rather through concrete examples than through abstract rules. Phonetics, it seems, is the best foundation to be built upon, for the grammatical study of a living tongue.

4. The amount of grammar, as well as of phonetics, to be taught in a class depends above all things on the age of the students: the older they are the more grammar and phonetics they will need; the younger they are the less they will need, and the better and the more easily they will learn the foreign language through direct imitation of the teacher, who, of course, must know it well himself.

5. Mr. Klinghardt is a staunch champion of what he calls, in a well-known book of his, "the imitative method." He advises the teacher to insist upon "direct imitation" as the best means of learning a foreign language, in regard to words, grammatical forms and constructions, and idiomatic expressions and phrases. I am surprised that he does not recommend "direct imitation" for the same purpose in regard to foreign sounds and sound-combinations.

6. The value of exercises in translating from the mother tongue into the foreign language and *vice versa*, which implies a continual comparing of the use of words, grammatical forms and constructions, and idiomatic expressions and phrases in the two languages, has been rightly contested by the adherents of the "reform-method." Translation exercises, if done moderately, may be of use in connection with the study of grammar, especially in the higher grades of language instruction, but they are hurtful at the beginning, since they tend to destroy the faculty of linguistic imitation which is usually very strong in younger students, and hinder them from learning the foreign language directly. I think it equally dangerous and may be as hurtful, especially at the beginning, to compare continually and systematically the sounds and sound-combinations of the mother

tongue with those of the foreign language.

7. The teacher, of course, has to study closely and know the native pronunciation of his students. But he can make use of this knowledge very often without comparing, and he may compare in many cases without his students being aware of it. I rather think that instead of being again and again reminded of their native pronunciation, they ought to be led to forget it while learning to pronounce foreign sounds in reading and speaking.

8. The best course to begin with, in teaching a living language, is always to enter *in medias res* as soon as possible, in every respect, and certainly also in regard to pronunciation. A few preliminary remarks and explanations about phonetics and the pronunciation of the two languages and some exercises with the foreign sounds are quite sufficient for the beginning. This can be done in a very short time and very conveniently by the aid of diagrams and charts. The signs which the student sees before him on these diagrams and charts represent for him *only the foreign* sounds, and *only the normal* sounds of the foreign language, and he has to practice these not in their isolated form, but by means of well-chosen keywords, which he also has continually before him, and which contain every sound in its natural environment of other foreign sounds. In this way he learns very quickly to find the famous *Indifferenzlage*, or basis of articulation, of the foreign language, and he will be well prepared to imitate correctly the teacher's pronunciation in other words and in whole sentences, and to read, under his guidance and strict control, phonetic texts in prose and verse, which will do the rest.

9. Such a method by no means excludes in the course of instruction an occasional comparing of native and foreign sounds. The teacher is doubtless even compelled to resort to the mother tongue and to the native dialect if he wishes to fight against, and do away with, certain individual defects of some of his students; for instance lisping, or certain dialectic peculiarities, like the voiceless pronunciation of the so-called "soft" consonants, *b, d, z*, etc., which are easily and persistently transmitted into the foreign language and often prove a

serious obstacle to the close imitation and correct acquisition of foreign sounds.

10. *Nota bene.*—The teacher's own pronunciation of the foreign language must be perfect, or at least sufficiently good. Otherwise, I believe, neither diagrams and charts with sounds and keywords, nor Klinghardt's exercises by the aid of ear, eye, mirror and speech-muscle will be of any use, and phonetics will be apt to become a by-word of ridicule.

§§ 94-96:²² Verschluss—und Öffnungs—*Glides*; die *p-t*- und *k-*Reihen; die *Lenes*—Reihen (*b, d, g*—*b, d, g*).

Als Bezeichnung für die mittelst starken Luftdruckes gebildete Reihe (*p, t, k*) dürfte sich der Ausdruck *fortis* und für die mit schwachem Luftdrucke gebildete Reihe (*b, d, g*) der Ausdruck *lenis* empfehlen Solche gehauchte *Lenes* herrschen allgemein in Süddeutschland und ebenso hier in der Rendsburger Gegend²³ . . . Franzosen und Engländer fassen beide gehauchte Reihen, *p, t, k* und *b, d, g*, als gleichartig auf, d. h. die verschiedene Stärke des Luftdruckes hat für ihr Ohr keinen sprachlichen Wert: gehauchte Öffnungs-*Glides* sind für sie unter allen Umständen *p, t, k*. Für die Franzosen und Engländer wie für die meisten Norddeutschen und für unsere Bühnen gelten als echte *b, d, g* lediglich die Öffnungs-*Glides* des getönten Luftstromes²⁴ . . . Natürlich sind aber die getönten Öffnungs-*Glide*. *b, d, g* gerade so ausgesprochene '*Lenes*' wie die gehauchten *b, d, g*, weil der schmale Luftstrom, welcher während des tönenden Schwingens der Kehlkopflippen zwischen den *chordæ vocales* empordringt, nur einen mässigen Luftdruck auf den Lippen- oder Zungenschluss auszuüben vermag.²⁵

I have already mentioned §§ 94-96 in connection with others in which K. speaks, or neglects to speak, of the plosive consonants. Here it is quite obvious again that we cannot arrive at a full understanding of the real nature of these consonants if we confine our observations almost exclusively to a single language. The pressure, or *Luftdruck*, is not at all weak when one pronounces French *b, d, g*; it seems to me as strong as when one pronounces French *p, t, k*. The two series of French plosives appear to my ear and "speech-muscle" as "hard" consonants or *fortes*. There is only one difference: French *p, t, k* are voiceless, and French *b, d, g* are, as a rule, strongly voiced; more so than North German

and English *b, d, g*. I think this view of the matter is confirmed by the fact that South and Central Germans who are accustomed to pronounce voiceless *Lenes* in their own language, do not perceive any difference between French *b, d, g* (*bain, dé, goût*) and French *p, t, k* (*pain, thé, coup*). Nevertheless, the difference that exists between the two series in French, is really very great. It is obscured and effaced only in cases of assimilation: cf. *forcé d[e] faire; je ne sais qu[e] dire*.

I hope that Rousselot and other experimental phoneticians will take up the whole question of plosives in several languages, and try to solve it by means of laryngoscopic and other phonetic instruments. I wish they would inform us by their investigations whether my conception and explanation of French *b, d, g* is right or wrong. At any rate, it is entirely at variance with Klinghardt's theory stated in one of the passages quoted above; and although I am pretty sure of my ear and "speech-muscle" in my own observations, I trust them, in such delicate questions, much less than the convincing proofs of Rousselot's experiments.

There are many more extremely interesting points in §§ 94-96 and in the last paragraph: "Die vokalischen Gleitlaute (Diphthonge)," but they would require a rather long discussion. I therefore prefer to close my review by again recommending Mr. Klinghardt's important work to the attention of every philologist, phonetician and language teacher.

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

SPANISH POETRY.

Los Cantares de Myo Cid, con una Introduccion y Notas por Dr. EDUARDO LIDFORSS. Acta Universitatis Lundensis, Tom. xxi, 1895, Text; Tom. xxii, 1896, Notes. Lund: E. Malmström. 4to, pp. viii, 164.

A new publication of the *Poema del Cid* is a matter of the greatest interest, inasmuch as previous editions have been shown to be extremely defective. Sanchez, in 1779, first published the poem in the free and inaccurate manner of the time. In 1858 Damas Hinard produced the second edition at Paris, basing his text upon that of Sanchez, and carefully

²² Pages 237-247.

²³ Page 245.

²⁴ Page 246.

²⁵ Page 247.